

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

| Summary project data | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|------------------------|
| GEF project ID | | 3205 | |
| GEF Agency project ID | | 3779 | |
| GEF Replenishment Phase | | GEF-4 | |
| Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects) | | UNDP | |
| Project name | | Sustainable Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants in Mauritius | |
| Country/Countries | | Mauritius | |
| Region | | Africa | |
| Focal area | | Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) | |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives | | SP-1; SP-2 | |
| Executing agencies involved | | Ministry of Environment, Sustainable Development, Disaster and Solid Waste Management; Ministry of Health and Quality of Life (secondary executing agency) | |
| NGOs/CBOs involvement | | APEXHOM; MACOSS; MFW; PANeM | |
| Private sector involvement | | Not specified | |
| CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP) | | April 10, 2008 | |
| Effectiveness date / project start | | June 24, 2008 | |
| Expected date of project completion (at start) | | March 2012 | |
| Actual date of project completion | | March 31, 2015 | |
| Project Financing | | | |
| | | At Endorsement (US \$M) | At Completion (US \$M) |
| Project Preparation Grant | GEF funding | .05 | .05 |
| | Co-financing | .01 | .01 |
| GEF Project Grant | | .90 | .90 |
| Co-financing | IA own | | .08 |
| | Government | .9 | 2.38 |
| | Other multi- /bi-laterals | .03 | |
| | Private sector | | |
| | NGOs/CSOs | | |
| Total GEF funding | | .95 | .95 |
| Total Co-financing | | .94 | 2.46 |
| Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing) | | 1.89 | 3.41 |
| Terminal evaluation/review information | | | |
| TE completion date | | May 2015 | |
| Author of TE | | William Kwan and Laurence Reno | |
| TER completion date | | March 14, 2016 | |
| TER prepared by | | Laura Nissley | |
| TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review) | | Molly Watts | |

2. Summary of Project Ratings

| Criteria | Final PIR | IA Terminal Evaluation | IA Evaluation Office Review | GEF IEO Review |
|---|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Project Outcomes | -- | S | -- | S |
| Sustainability of Outcomes | | ML | -- | ML |
| M&E Design | | S | -- | MU |
| M&E Implementation | | S | -- | MS |
| Quality of Implementation | | S | -- | MS |
| Quality of Execution | | S | -- | S |
| Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report | | -- | -- | MS |

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Project Document¹ does not directly state the Global Environmental Objectives of the project. There has been no importation of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Mauritius since the early 1980s and of polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs) since 2004. At the time of the project design, DDT was still used in malaria vector control, and PCBs were still in a limited amount of transformers. The goal of this project was to create the conditions for eliminating the use of DDT and PCBs, discard existing stockpiles, treating contaminated sites, putting regulations in place, and raising awareness (Project Document pg. 9). Although the stockpiles on Mauritius were relatively small, they have led to environmental contamination (Project Document, Part 1, pg. 6).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was to “reduce emission of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) into the global environment” (Project Document, Part 2, pg. 34). The Project Document also notes that the objective of the project was the “implementation of the first two priorities from the National Implementation Plan (NIP).” The first two objectives of the NIP were as follows: (1) Disposal of obsolete POPs chemicals and decontamination of POPs-infested areas, and (2) Development of alternative strategies for malaria vector management with reduced—or no—reliance on dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT) (Part 1, pgs. 5-6). These two objectives were also referred to as the “themes” of the project.

The Project Document identifies two key outcomes under these themes (Part 2, pg, 19; 31):

- Outcome 1: Removal in an environmentally sustainable way of obsolete POPs pesticide and PCB stocks and the remediation of related soil contamination; and

¹ The Project Document referred to in this TER includes both Part 1 and Part 2 of the “Request for Funding” document submitted on December 28, 2007.

- Outcome 2: An enhanced capacity to develop and implement alternative strategies for malaria vector management

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes to the project’s objectives or outcomes during implementation. The project team did make the strategic decision to reallocate funds marked for the Central Data Management System to develop a payment incentive scheme to recruit volunteers for the integrated vector management (IVM) strategy pilots (TE pg. 22).

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| 4.1 Relevance | Rating: Satisfactory |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|

The TE provides a rating of “relevant” for this aspect of project outcomes, which this TER adjusts to **Satisfactory**. The project outcomes are consistent with the GEF-4 Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) Focal Area, specifically Strategic Program 1, *Strengthening capacity for National Implementation Plan (NIP) development and implementation*, and Strategic Program 2, *Partnering in investments for NIP implementation*. Mauritius ratified the Stockholm Convention in 2004, and with GEF and UNDP technical assistance, prepared a POPs National Implementation Plan (NIP) in 2005. On August 25, 2006, the Government of Mauritius approved the NIP, making it eligible to received further GEF support under paragraph 9(b) of the GEF Instrument (Project Document pg. 4).

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 4.2 Effectiveness | Rating: Satisfactory |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, and this TER concurs. The project achieved its objective of completing the first two priorities from Mauritius’s National Implementation Plan (NIP). The project’s efforts to dispose of obsolete POPs stocks and remove DDT contamination from affected soil produced results beyond what was anticipated in the original project design. The project also successfully eliminated the use of DDT for vector control spraying and airports and seaports. The project did experience some challenges with the integrated vector management (IVM) strategy pilots,

however momentum was built for national replication. Overall, the project completed all planned activities and achieved expected results, with the exception of the Central Data Management System (TE pg. 22).

A summary of the project’s achievements, by outcome, is provided below:

- **Outcome 1: Removal in an environmentally sustainable way obsolete POPs pesticide and PCB stocks and the remediation of related soil contamination**

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) evaluation and safeguarding of POPs inventories, (2) disposal of obsolete POPs stocks, (3) removal of DDT contamination from contaminated soil, and (4) institution of a “Responsible Care” program for industry and agricultural associations that focuses on safe and sustainable handling and disposal of chemicals. The TE notes that all expected results were achieved by project end. Furthermore, the Government of Mauritius went beyond the scope of the project to dispose of an additional 46 tons of DDT and 6.7 tons of hazardous chemicals, as well as decontaminating the soil and premises of two additional sites. In total 300 cubic meters of DDT contaminated soil from three sites² was shipped to the Netherlands for sound disposal (TE pg. 26). Additionally, the Responsible Care program was successfully implemented, reaching 354 participants from 40 organizations (TE pg. 6).

- **Outcome 2: An enhanced capacity to develop and implement alternative strategies for malaria vector management**

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) continued need for DDT evaluated, (2) decentralization of surveillance capacity to the district level, (3) decentralized IVM established, and (4) IVM strategy demonstrated in pilot sites. By project end, Mauritius’s continued need for DDT was evaluated, and the use of DDT was successfully substituted with pyrethroids for vector control spraying and airports and seaports (TE pg. 26). The TE also notes that vector surveillance was decentralized, and a decentralized IVM strategy was established and piloted in eight villages. However the TE notes that the IVM pilots generated mixed results. Although the project organized trainings, established IVM committees, and developed an IVM manual, community interest remained low. Moreover, a Longitudinal Impact Assessment Study found that while communities had knowledge of mosquito proliferation practices, community mobilization was tentative (TE pg. 7). The TE notes however that there is momentum to be built upon (pg. 27).

| | |
|----------------|--|
| 4.3 Efficiency | Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |
|----------------|--|

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project experienced moderate delays at start-up due to challenges recruiting a project manager. As a result, the Inception Workshop did not take place until April 2009; nearly a year after the

² The original targeted site (Pamplemousses Powder Mill), and the two additional sites (Mahebourg Hospitals and Fort George).

GEF CEO endorsed the project. The project experienced more significant delays during implementation, largely due to two factors: (1) challenges obtaining transit permits for the shipment of obsolete Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) chemicals and the contaminated soil, and (2) challenges attracting volunteers for the integrated vector management (IVM) pilots. As a result, the project was extended three years beyond the expected date of completion in order to achieve key results (TE pg. 16). The TE notes however, that the project was cost-effective. The project completed all activities within the allocated GEF budget, and was able to secure additional co-financing to dispose of more POPs stocks and DDT contaminated soil than was anticipated in the project design (TE pg. 22).

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| 4.4 Sustainability | Rating: Moderately Likely |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for project sustainability, and this TER concurs. There are no specified environmental risks to sustainability, however there are moderate financial and sociopolitical risks associated with the continuation of activities under Theme 2 (integrated vector management).

Financial Resources

This TER provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for the sustainability of financial resources. Results under Theme 1 (disposal of obsolete POPs and clean-up of contaminated sites) were effectively achieved by project end. The “Responsible Care” program, which focused on strengthening the country’s capacity for sound chemicals management, was slated to be continued under a follow-up project under the SAICM Quick Start Program (TE pg. 19). However, the TE notes that the continued financing of activities under Theme 2 (integrated vector management strategy) was not ensured by project end.

Sociopolitical

This TER provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for sociopolitical sustainability. The TE notes that the Government of Mauritius is fully committed to meeting its obligation under the Stockholm Convention, which is evidenced by the significant involvement of government agencies in the execution of the project. However, the integrated vector management pilots generated low interest and low community mobilization. The TE notes that the sustainability of IVM in Mauritius will depend on a stronger public awareness campaign (pg. 30).

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

The TE does not provide enough information to assess the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance.

Environmental

This TER provides a rating of **Likely** for environmental sustainability. The TE does not cite any environmental risks that affect sustainability. Moreover, Mauritius was free of obsolete POPs chemicals and contaminated soil by project end. Additionally, the use of DDT was successfully substituted with pyrethroids for vector control spraying and airports and seaports (TE pg. 26).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Actual co-financing exceeded expected co-financing by approximately \$1.52 million, in large part due to an influx of funding from the Government of Mauritius to dispose of additional quantities of hazardous chemicals and to decontaminate soil from an additional two sites (Mahebourg Hospital and Fort George) (TE pg. 7). The additional co-financing allowed the project to exceed expectations under Theme 1 (Disposal of obsolete POPs chemicals and decontamination of POPs-infested areas).

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project experienced significant delays at start-up and during implementation, largely due to challenges recruiting a project manager; securing transit permits for the Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) chemicals and the contaminated soil; and attracting volunteers for the integrated vector management (IVM) pilots. The project was ultimately extended three years in order to complete activities. However, these delays did not affect the project's outcomes, which were achieved by the revised completion date.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership over the project was high throughout implementation. Two government ministries (Ministry of Environment, Sustainable Development, Disaster and Solid Waste Management; and Ministry of Health and Quality of Life) acted as executing agencies for the project, and the Government of Mauritius contributed a significant amount of co-financing. As mentioned above, the additional co-financing allowed the project to exceed expectations regarding the disposal of hazardous chemicals and soil decontamination. It should also be noted that other local stakeholders (other government ministries, NGOs, and academic institutions) were actively involved in the Project Steering Committee (TE pg. 17).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately

Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 6.1 M&E Design at entry | Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory |
|-------------------------|--|

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The Project Document provides two logical frameworks, which detail the intended outcomes, outputs and performance indicators under each “theme.” The indicators at the outcome level are generally SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely), particularly under Outcome 2: *Reduced seasonal densities of malaria vector mosquitos; Reduced annual use of DDT; and Absence of malaria outbreaks* (Project Document pg. 34). However, indicators at the output-level are essentially a series of activities rather than indicators. Some examples include: *Conduct a training needs assessment; Prepare a training syllabus; and Deliver the training*. Additionally, baseline values and targets are absent from the results framework.

The Project Document does outline a general M&E plan, which includes a few key M&E activities (annual reports, periodic reviews, and an independent final evaluation), responsible party, and associated budget and timeframe. However, there are no provisions for the set-up and maintenance of an M&E system, including data collection. Additionally, the total M&E budget was only \$20,000, or approximately 2% of the GEF budget. The vast majority of these funds were dedicated to the terminal evaluation (Project Document pg. 42). Overall, the results framework and M&E plan are inappropriate for the project.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| 6.2 M&E Implementation | Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |
|------------------------|--|

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE notes that both UNDP and the executing agency undertook effective and timely monitoring and evaluation activities (pg. 25). This TER confirms that the annual reports diligently tracked the implementation of activities, however as targets were not established for many of the indicators, it is difficult to ascertain progress toward achieving results. The TE does note however, that the Project Steering Committee met regularly, and that the project team used feedback from the M&E activities to adapt the project’s strategy. For example, the project decided to implement an incentive scheme to attract volunteers when it became clear that the integrated vector management (IVM) pilots were not yielding the anticipated results (TE pg. 20). For these reasons, a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** is appropriate for M&E implementation.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 7.1 Quality of Project Implementation | Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |
|---------------------------------------|--|

UNDP was the project implementing agency. The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE notes that the project was well-designed, with a clear strategy for addressing the first two priorities of Mauritius's National Implementation Plan (NIP). This TER concurs, however the proposed M&E plan was weak, and did not provide clear indicators and targets for assessing project performance. The TE also notes that the intended results were achievable within the anticipated four-year implementation period. However, the project experienced significant delays during implementation, in part due to challenges obtaining transit permits for the shipment of obsolete Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) chemicals and the contaminated soil. The TE notes that while other GEF projects focused on POPs disposal and decontamination were used as a reference for resource calculations, the remote location of Mauritius made such comparisons of limited use (pg. 17). Despite these delays, UNDP provided strong support to the executing agency throughout implementation, and the project achieved its expected results (TE pg. 25). Therefore, a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** is justified.

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 7.2 Quality of Project Execution | Rating: Satisfactory |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for quality of project execution, and this TER concurs. The executing agency for the project was the Ministry of Environment, Sustainable Development, Disaster and Solid Waste Management (MoE). The Ministry of Health and Quality of Life (MoH) acted as a secondary executing agency and was responsible for executing all activities under Outcome 2 (developing and implementing alternative strategies for malaria vector management). The TE notes that both the MoE and the MoH successfully performed their duties and responsibilities (pg. 25). The project did experience delays during start-up due to challenges recruiting a project manager. These delays

contributed to the need for a significant extension of the project's timeline, however the project did ultimately achieve, and in some cases surpass, its expected outcomes. It should also be noted that financial resources were used prudently and disbursement strictly followed UNDP's financial rules and regulations (TE pg. 22).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

By project end, the following amounts of POPs Chemicals were disposed of: 138 tons of DDT; 13 litres of Dieldrin; 63 kg of Mirex; 13 litres of Aldrin; and 5,000 kg of PCB containing oil. Additionally, 300 cubic meters of DDT contaminated soil from three sites³ was soundly disposed of (TE pg. 26).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not cite any socioeconomic changes that occurred by project end.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

³ The original targeted site (Pamplemousses Powder Mill), and the two additional sites (Mahebourg Hospitals and Fort George).

The TE notes that by project end, Mauritius's capacity to soundly manage hazardous and dangerous waste was strengthened. Over 50 participants were trained on the international conventions/agreements on POPs (TE pg. 26). 354 participants from 40 organizations were also trained on the safe and sustainable handling and disposal of chemicals under the Responsible Care Program (TE pg. 6). In terms of integrated vector management, a Longitudinal Impact Assessment Study revealed that communities had sufficient knowledge of practices to prevent mosquito proliferation, however mobilization was low (TE pg. 7).

b) Governance

The TE does not cite any changes in governance that occurred by the end of the project.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not cite any unintended impacts that occurred by project end.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE notes that the "Responsible Care" program initiated under GEF-UNDP project was slated to be scaled up through the SAICM Quick Start Program (TE pg. 19).

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE provides the following lessons learned (pgs. 32-33):

- Sound technical inputs and relevant experience is a contributing factor to successful project design and implementation. In both Theme 1 (Disposal of obsolete POPs chemicals and decontamination of POPs-infested areas) and Theme 2 (Development and Demonstration of Alternatives Strategies for Malaria Vector Management), international technical experts and national technical experts worked collaboratively to provide sound technical guidance and inputs, conducted technical workshops and training sessions.
- Good planning is essential to ensure timely project inputs to achieve project outcomes. The

project experienced a 36-month delay in project operational completion due to three main reasons: a) delay in the recruitment and subsequently the premature departure of the project manager; b) the time required to secure the transit permit for the transportation of the obsolete POPs pesticides and contaminated soil to the final destination for environmentally sound disposal; and 3) the eventual need to deploy an incentive scheme to attract the active participation of the IVM volunteers. Better planning and anticipation of the difficulties would have minimized the length of the delay. [SEP]

- In addressing malaria vector management, adopt an integrated approach to address a holistic approach on water borne diseases. Since MoH [Ministry of Health] already has an “Operational Plan for the Prevention and Control of Chikungunya and Dengue” issued in November 2009, it might have been more effective to incorporate the IVM strategy into this operational plan as an overall water borne diseases issue, rather than as a stand-alone vector management issue. [SEP]

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pg. 32):

Theme 1 – Disposal of obsolete POPs chemicals and decontamination of POPs-infested areas

- It is recommended that the MoH [Ministry of Health] to undertake periodic inspection on the stored DDT stock, in order to detect leakage and ensure its safe storage
- MoE [Ministry of Environment] should encourage and attract active participation of the private sector and industrial associations involved in the import, distribution, use and handling of pesticides and hazardous chemicals to put the Responsible Care Program into practice to achieve sound chemicals management.

Theme 2 – Development and Demonstration of Alternative Strategies for Malaria Vector Management

- MoH to incorporate the responsibilities of IVM [integrated vector management] coordination into the TOR of regional health officers; and the tasks of community vector surveillance into the TOR of district health inspectors so that assignment and responsibilities are clearly defined and understood
- District Councils to systematically undertake regular bulk cleanup in communities
- MoLG [Ministry of Local Government] to enforce stricter application of the Public Health Act regarding responsibilities of vacant land owners
- Design and establish the much needed Central Data Management System (CDMS) to capture and analyze vector data for effective monitoring of water borne diseases

- Involve and empower youth and women organizations, and encourage NGOs to actively participate in the implementation of the IVM strategy
- Encourage active participation of high school and university students in data collection and vector surveillance through innovative incentives such as free computer training programs which would broaden their skills set for future employment possibilities
- Increase public awareness through intensive mass media promotion and publicity
- Initiate creative incentives to generate increased and sustained participation at community level
- Through private-public-partnership, dedicate a certain percentage of the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) fund to finance better environment/personal health management through effective vector control and management
- Institute recognition and award system to motivate active volunteer work in the implementation of the IVM strategy

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

| Criteria | GEF IEO comments | Rating |
|---|---|-----------|
| To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? | The report contains an adequate assessment of the project's outcomes and impacts. It was unclear in some cases, however, whether targets were achieved (this may be because the project did not clearly articulate its targets, however the report does not address this). | MS |
| To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated? | The report is internally consistent, and provided convincing evidence for some aspects of project effectiveness (i.e. inventory of POPs chemicals disposed). However, more evidence was needed to substantiate some of its claims (i.e. IVM pilots). Ratings in other areas (efficiency, M&E, and implementation) were mildly inflated. | MS |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy? | The sustainability section of the report is brief, however relevant risks are identified in other sections. More attention could have been paid to institutional and governance risks. | MS |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? | The lessons learned are not comprehensive and largely focus on the importance of "technical inputs" and "good planning," which is fairly obvious. The lesson on generating a holistic approach to IVM is more useful. | MU |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? | The report includes actual project costs and actual co-financing used. | S |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems: | The report does provide some analysis of the project's M&E design, however this TER largely disagrees with its findings. M&E implementation is only superficially covered | MU |
| Overall TE Rating | | MS |

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).